

Arts & Sciences Senate  
October 16th, 2000  
Tentative Agenda

- I. Introduction
- II. Approval of Minutes from April 17, 2000
- III. Report of Academic Judiciary Review Committee-Fred Walter
- IV. Proposed Guidelines for AJC
- V. What our Secretary Needs You to Do to Do His Job
- VI. Dean Succession
- VII. Other Old Business
- VIII. Other New Business

Andrea Tyree  
President  
Arts & Sciences Senate

---

Arts and Sciences Senate  
Minutes from Senate Meeting  
April 17th, 2000

Secretary: Robert Bloomer

The Meeting was called to order at 3:37 p.m.

I. Agenda. After Item V was moved up to IV, the Agenda was approved.

II. Minutes of the Senate Meeting on February 21st, 2000. The Minutes were approved.

III. Report of the CAS Senate President (Hugh J. Silverman). The President drew attention to the upcoming Senate elections. He asked those present to make suggestions for the positions that are becoming vacant. He then provided an update on issues in the Academic Judiciary Committee. An ad hoc committee was formed by the Executive Committee to review the AJC and to provide guidelines much like those of the PTC. He added that Fred Walter, Chair of the ad hoc committee, has been doing a good job and has already drafted a report. The Committee on Faculty Rights, Responsibilities, and Retirements, had already presented guidelines for departmental by-laws which were approved by the Senate. The next issue is that of academic appointment terminology and practice. To be clarified are the distinctions among (1) a Combined Appointment, which involves a divided budget line; (2) a Joint Appointment, where there is only one line but full responsibilities in two or more departments; (3) an Affiliated faculty member, which entails limited but specified responsibilities by a full-time faculty member in one department to another department, and (4) an Adjunct faculty member, which is a temporary or per course appointment. The Committee on Faculty Rights, Responsibilities and Retirements will present the further results of their deliberations on this question to the Senate in the Fall. The FRRR Committee is also looking into the question of establishing a local Senior Lecturer title, which would be granted to Lecturers on term appointments over extended periods of time. Then the President asked Associate Provost Mark Aronoff to provide an update on the report from Albany on the General Education Requirements. Mary Rawlinson and he have been working closely with the Curriculum Committee to formulate a response, which will be sent forthwith with the proviso that nothing Mark Aronoff says is final because approval of the University Senate will be required before anything is final.



IV. Proposed Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Committee Guidelines (Everett Waters, Chair, PTC). The first revision is in Section 4.4, to allow explanation of the PTC's recommendation. Currently, it reads: After completing its deliberations, the Committee will forward the file together with its own recommendation to the Dean for review. The proposed change reads: After completing its deliberations, the Committee will report its vote and recommendations to the Administration. The report may include an explanation of the Committee's recommendations if it is signed by each voting member of the Committee. The motion for this change passed 19 to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The second revision is to add a new Section 7 to define procedures for revising Guidelines. The proposed texts reads as follows: These Guidelines shall be reviewed by the Arts and Sciences on a regular basis. The Senate may make revisions to the Guidelines at its regular meetings. Proposals for revisions to the Guidelines shall be included in advance in the Proposed Agenda for a regular Senate meeting. Any changes to the Guidelines approved by the Senate will be submitted to the University President for review and comment. If the President finds the changes(s) consistent with the Policies of the Board of Trustees, the Senate President shall include it in the published Guidelines and report it to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for implementation. The motion for this change passed 19 to 0, with 3 abstentions.

V. Arts and Sciences Senate Academic Planning Committee (APC). Since it would entail a constitutional change, as mandated the question of forming a new committee on Academic Planning had already been discussed at the two previous Senate meetings. Therefore, it was time to take a vote on the question. The question: should the Senate set up an Academic Planning Committee which would be a regular Standing Committee of the Arts and Sciences Senate (with the usual 6 representative members). The general sentiment was that this function is already performed by the A&S Senate Executive Committee. Hence the response was overwhelmingly against the formation of such a committee, as reflected in the vote of 21 against and only 1 for it with no abstentions.

VI. Report of the College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean for Curriculum (Mary Rawlinson). With the help of a handout bearing the motto "Everything is connected to everything else" (Leibniz), Mary Rawlinson described the principles they adhere to at Stony Brook as a student-centered research university. She identified problems for students, such as the gap between students' preparation and the expectations and opportunities provided by our research faculty. She identified problems for the faculty, such as the lack of an infrastructure to support teaching. She outlined strategies to address these problems, such as the development of collaborative learning communities focused on research and the development of transposable skills and inquiry-based learning. These strategies are being implemented through the Learning Communities Project, the University Writing Program, and the Freshman Mathematics Advisory Committee. She described some of the results, such as improved coordination between the academic sector and admissions and orientation. Finally, she outlined the challenges of meeting unmet demand, staffing interdisciplinary and collaborative learning projects, securing an infrastructure that will support curricular innovation and collaboration, and revising the administrative infrastructure for curriculum to facilitate collaborative curriculum development.

VII. Old Business. None

VIII. New Business. None

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

